



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/807,975

03/24/2004

Alex Krister Raith

4740-193

4453

24112 7590 11/28/2008  
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC  
1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300  
Cary, NC 27518

EXAMINER

FAROUL, FARAH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/28/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/807,975  
Filing Date: March 24, 2004  
Appellant(s): RAITH ET AL.

---

Michael D. Murphy  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on November 11, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed on March 28, 2008.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-14 and 26-30 are rejected as being indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-16, 18-20, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

Claims 5-8, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-14 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term “default” in claims 1 and 26 is used by the claim to mean “a format suitable for a particular destination address”, while the accepted meaning is “in the

Art Unit: 2416

absence of,” Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary. Thus, the term “default” would be applied consistent with its accepted meaning if the default format was applied to a destination address when no other format was designated. Since the claims appear to require that the “default format” be specified for certain destination addresses, the term “default” is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. For purposes of prior art rejections, Examiner will treat the “default format” to be a format suitable for a destination address. Examiner notes that this interpretation does not work in claims 14 and 26 since it would require a determination of the transcoding to be performed, and then require an additional determination of the transcoding to be performed, where this transcoding would have been determined in the previous determination step.

Therefore, Examiner will not make any prior art rejection for claims 14 and 26-30.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15, 16, 18-20, 22-23, 25, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

6. Regarding claims 1 and 31, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method

Art Unit: 2416

comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information); and sending the messages according to their destination network addresses (§ [0029], where the message is sent to a user).

7. Regarding claim 2, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses comprises performing transcoding for messages targeted to email addresses (§ [0002], where MMS allows the use of email, and § [0036], where “addressing information” is generically specified, such that it includes email addresses, see also §§ [0065]- [0067], where an exemplary rules database performs certain functions based on email addresses).

8. Regarding claim 3, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses comprises not performing transcoding for messages not targeted to email addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing

Art Unit: 2416

information, such that users can specify not to perform transcoding on messages not targeted to email addresses).

9. Regarding claim 4, Trossen discloses selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

10. Regarding claim 9, Trossen discloses that the originating network comprises a first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and §§ [0025]-[0027], where the originating network is wireless communication network, ref. 212), and wherein sending the messages according to their destination network addresses comprises sending the messages from one or more Multimedia Messaging Services (MMS) servers in the first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and §§ [0025]-[0027], where the messages are send from MMS, ref. 214, in the originating network).

11. Regarding claim 10, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses comprises performing default transcoding for outgoing messages targeted to Internet domains and not performing default transcoding for outgoing messages targeted to wireless network domains (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the

Art Unit: 2416

respective recipients based on addressing information, such that the rules can be set in a manner in which “default transcoding” is performed for messages destined to IP domains and no “default transcoding” is performed for messages destined for wireless networks, see also ¶¶ [0046]-[0047]).

12. Regarding claim 11, Trossen discloses for outgoing messages targeted to wireless network domains, determining whether transcoding is desired for a particular outgoing message targeted to a particular wireless network domain, and, if so, transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in that message into a format specified for that particular wireless network domain (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information, see also ¶¶ [0046]-[0047]).

13. Regarding claim 12, Trossen discloses that determining whether transcoding is desired for a particular outgoing message targeted to a particular wireless network domain comprises determining whether a database identifies that particular network as one for which transcoding is desired (¶¶ [0046]-[0047], where a network rule is checked to see if transcoding is required for a particular network, see also ¶¶ [0034],[0036]).

14. Regarding claim 13, Trossen discloses identifying from information stored in the database the format specified for that particular network (¶¶ [0046]-[0047], where a network rule is checked to see if transcoding is required for a particular network, see also ¶¶ [0034],[0036]).



Art Unit: 2416

15. Regarding claims 15 and 32, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity (¶ [0023], where the user databases, i.e. a second entity, store the rules, and ¶ [0036], where the rules are stored according to address, such that to obtain a rule the processing element (the MMS server or rule processor as taught in ¶ [0024]), i.e. the first entity, would have to retrieve the rule from the user database, see also ¶ [0060], where the rule processor determines “whether any stored recipient rules are associated with the recipient of the [message]”); receiving at the first entity a corresponding indication from the second entity as to whether multimedia content transcoding is desired for the message (¶ [0023], where the processing element, i.e. the first entity, will receive the rule from the user database, i.e. the second entity, and ¶ [0034], where the rules deal with transcoding, see also ¶ [0060]); selectively performing transcoding at the first entity based on the indication (¶ [0060], where the rule processor performs the transcoding, see also ¶ [0034]); and sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address (¶ [0029], where the message is sent to a user, and ¶ [0024], where the rules may be executed by the MMS server, which is also the device that transmits the message to the user).

16. Regarding claim 16, Trossen discloses that the second entity is external to the originating network (Fig. 2, where the originating network is ref. 212 and the database is

Art Unit: 2416

stored in ref. 220, i.e. the database storing the rules is in the destination network, see also ¶ [0059]).

17. Regarding claim 18, Trossen discloses that the originating network comprises a first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and ¶¶ [0025]-[0027], where the originating network is wireless communication network, ref. 212), and wherein sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity comprises sending an indication of a destination mobile telephone number targeted by the message (¶ [0036], where the rules are stored according to destination address, such as a telephone number).

18. Regarding claim 19, Trossen discloses receiving from the first entity a corresponding indication from the second entity as to whether multimedia content transcoding is desired for the message comprises receiving an indication from the second entity that identifies a desired format for transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message (¶ [0034], where it is implicit that the rule stores the desired format for the transcoding).

19. Regarding claim 20, Trossen discloses that selectively performing transcoding at the first entity based on the indication comprises determining whether the corresponding indication returned by the second entity indicates that transcoding is desired and, if so, transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message into the desired format (¶ [0034], where the message is transcoded if the rule dictates that transcoding is desired).

Art Unit: 2416

20. Regarding claims 22 and 33, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: forwarding an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity (§ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, passes a received message to a rule processor, i.e. a second entity); receiving the message back from the second entity at the first entity, after the second entity has subjected the message to selective transcoding of multimedia content in the message (§ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, receives the message back from the rule processor, i.e. a second entity, after the rule processor has executed rules, and § [0061], where the rules include transcoding, see also §§ [0034],[0036]); and sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address (§ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, delivers the message content).

21. Regarding claim 23, Trossen discloses that the second entity is external to the originating network (Fig. 2, where the originating network is ref. 212 and the database is stored in ref. 220, i.e. the database storing the rules is in the destination network, see also § [0059]).

22. Regarding claim 25, Trossen discloses that the second entity selectively performs transcoding of multimedia content in the message by determining whether transcoding is desired for the message based on a destination address of the message and, if transcoding is desired, transcoding at least a portion of multimedia content in the message from a first coding format into a second coding format (§ [0034], where “one or

Art Unit: 2416

more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 5-8, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

25. Regarding claim 5, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses comprises determining that an outgoing message is targeted to a particular address, and transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message into a format specified for the targeted address (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

Trossen does not expressly disclose that the particular address is related to a particular wireless network domain. However, Trossen does disclose specifying a particular type of message be delivered over a particular type of network (¶ [0046],

Art Unit: 2416

where a rule can be defined that requires media content to be delivered over a given type of network, and where the networks are wireless networks), where the type of network may require a specific format for delivery (§ [0047], where the network may require transcoding). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine that an outgoing message is targeted to a particular wireless network domain and transcoding at least a portion of the content in the message into a format specified for the targeted wireless network domain to ensure that the message is delivered over a given network in a format appropriate for that network.

26. Regarding claim 6, Trossen discloses that determining that an outgoing message is targeted to a wireless network domain comprises identifying a targeted mobile telephone number for the outgoing message (§ [0036], where addresses can be telephone numbers) and identifying a name of the wireless network domain based on accessing an ENUM database that associates mobile station telephone numbers with particular wireless network domains (§ [0046], where the rules database, i.e. an ENUM database, implicitly associates the telephone number with particular domains, e.g. 2G mobile networks or 3G mobile networks, since the type of network is identified based on the incoming message, which includes destination telephone number).

27. Regarding claim 7, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses comprises transcoding audio content in the outgoing message from a first audio coding format

Art Unit: 2416

associated with the originating communication network into a second audio coding format specified for the targeted wireless network domain ([0046]-[0047], where a rule can be defined that requires media content to be transcoded before delivery over a given type of network).

28. Regarding claim 8, Trossen does not expressly disclose that the originating network comprises either a GSM wireless communication network, or a cdma2000 wireless communication network, and the targeted wireless network domain corresponds either to a GSM wireless communication network, or to a cdma2000 wireless communication network. However, Trossen does disclose that the originating network is a 2G mobile network or a 3G mobile network and that the destination network is a 2G mobile network or a 3G mobile network ([0046]). Examiner takes official notice that GSM is a well-known 2G wireless communication protocol and that cdma2000 is a well known 3G wireless communication protocol. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the originating network comprise either a GSM wireless communication network, or a cdma2000 wireless communication network, and the targeted wireless network domain corresponds either to a GSM wireless communication network, or to a cdma2000 wireless communication network to increase the industrial applicability of Trossen's system by allowing it to operate over commonly used wireless communication protocols.

29. Regarding claim 17, Trossen does not expressly disclose that sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity comprises forwarding the message from the first entity to the second

Art Unit: 2416

entity, and wherein the message includes the destination address information.

However, Trossen does disclose sending the entire message to a second entity when the entity processes the message (¶ [0059]). Trossen also discloses that the rules may be retrieved according to any of a number of manners (¶ [0036]), such that rules may be retrieved based on more information than just the destination address information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send to the second entity the entire message to allow the second entity to retrieve from the message the pertinent information needed to retrieve the pertinent rule.

30. Regarding claim 21, Trossen does not expressly disclose that sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address comprises sending the message to a multimedia server in a destination network for subsequent delivery to a targeted recipient. However, Trossen does disclose that a first MMS server in an originating network will send the message to a second MMS server in a destination network (¶¶ [0056]-[0059]). Trossen also discloses that the rules may be used to provide more efficient communication over a network (¶ [0045]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message to a multimedia server in a destination network for subsequent delivery to a targeted recipient to enable the message to be delivered in a manner in which efficient communication can be utilized over the network connecting the originating and destination multimedia servers.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Regarding applicant's argument to the definition of the word "default" to mean "a selection made usually automatically or without active consideration due to a lack of viable alternative" or "a selection automatically used by a computer program in the absence of a choice made by a user", even if said definition is applied, it would contradict applicant's claims. Applicant is reminded that independent claims 1, 26 and 31 call for: "**selectively** transcoding multimedia messages from **a current format into a default format** as a function of their destination network addresses", meaning that the transcoding is not done automatically as would be required by applicant's definition of "default" but rather as a choice. The examiner also emphasizes that the "default format" is being treated as "a format suitable for that particular destination address".

31. Claim 1 recites: "selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses." Here, the claim only requires the selection of a default format as a function of a destination network address. There is no mention that another format could be selected, where the selection of the default format only occurs when the another format is not available. Thus, the claim requires that every selection of a format also be the selection of a "default format." The use of the term "default" in this context renders the metes and bounds of the claim vague and indefinite.

32. Applicant goes on to assert that "its use of the term 'default' in the rejected claims is abundantly clear to those skilled in the art, in view of the specification." Response: p.

14. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As outlined above, the use of the term "default" in



Art Unit: 2416

the claims is inconsistent with the plain meaning of the term. While Examiner recognizes that Applicant can act as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Examiner cannot find any place in the Specification where Applicant has redefined the term “default” by setting forth a definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that Applicant has redefined the term. In view of the foregoing, Examiner asserts that Applicant’s use of the term “default” in the claims is inconsistent with how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term, even when the claim is read in light of the specification.

33. Regarding the anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner maintains that the definitions proffered by Applicant create ambiguities within the claims, such that Examiner is required to interpret the claim in a manner that renders the prior art applicable. *Ex Parte Ionescu*, 222 USPQ at 539. *See also* MPEP § 2143.03. If Applicant does not agree with the definition that Examiner used for the term “default” then Applicant is free to clearly define the term in the claims – provided that this definition results in the “claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the application regards as his invention,” as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Art Unit: 2416

34. Applicant then discusses various teachings in the Specification which Applicant asserts “exemplifies” the meaning of “default” and “specific.” Applicant is reminded that, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Here, Applicant has failed to *explicitly* define the terms “default” and “specific” in the Specification. As such, it is inappropriate for Examiner to read in Applicant’s “exemplifications” from the Specification to define the terms in the Specification. Further, Examiner maintains that, even if Examiner could read in these limitations from the Specification, the claims would continue to be vague and indefinite under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, such that Examiner would be required to interpret the claims to apply the prior art, because, as outlined above, Applicant’s asserted definitions set up ambiguities in the claims.

35. Finally, Applicant asserts that Trossen does not disclose the use of the claimed default format. Examiner maintains that Trossen anticipates the claims in light of the definition given to “default” by Examiner. In view of the foregoing, Examiner maintains that the claims are vague and indefinite, such that Examiner is required to interpret the claim in a manner that renders the prior art applicable. *Ex Parte Ionescu*, 222 USPQ at 539. See *also* MPEP § 2143.03. If Applicant does not agree with the definition that Examiner used for the term “default” then Applicant should amend the claims to resolve these ambiguities.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

Art Unit: 2416

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Farah Faroul/

Examiner, Art Unit 2416

Conferees:

/FIRMIN BACKER/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Huy D. Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616